

ARM. CANAWT' 'KNOWN'

FREDERIK KORTLANDT
UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN

The PIE sequence **CRHC* appears to have a twofold reflex in Armenian, cf. *čanač'em* 'I know', *canawt'* 'known', *atač'em* 'I implore', *atawt'k'* 'prayer' (e.g., Winter 1965: 103f., Klingenschmitt 1982: 167, fn. 13). Scholars are in disagreement on the origin of these forms.

The obvious source for *čanač'em* is **ǵnH³skelo-*, which should yield **canac'em*. Meillet assumes "élargissement d'un présent en **-ske-* par le suffixe **-ye-*" (1936: 109) and "assimilation du *c* initial d'un ancien **canač'em*" (p. 29). This is doubtless correct. The addition of the present formative **-ye-* was motivated by the spread of **-ske-* as an aorist and subjunctive marker.

Though Pedersen originally derived the present formative *č'* from palatalized **sk* (1905: 207), he later changed his mind (thus explicitly 1906:422) in favor of a derivation from single **k*, which he identifies with the velar in Gr. ἔθηκε and Latin *faciō* (1906: 348). But the latter is not a present formative. Moreover, the

expected reflex of the Greek and Latin suffix should rather be Arm. *s*, certainly to those who do not accept three unconditioned series of velar obstruents for the proto-language. Meillet's theory is certainly preferable both formally and semantically.

Winter (1965: 104) and Godel (1975: 80) derive *čanač'em* and *canawt'* from **-ky-* and **-kt-*, respectively. While Godel relegates the origin of this **k* to "the gloomy history of PA" (1975: 124), Winter derives it from the root-final laryngeal. The problem with this derivation is that it separates *čanač'em* and *atač'em* from the other *č'*-presents, which are left out of consideration, and introduces a zero-grade *ye*-present where we would expect either a zero-grade *ske*-present, which we find in other languages, or a full-grade *ye*-present on the basis of the root aorist. Zero-grade *ye*-presents have stative or passive meaning, e.g. Gr. *μαίνεται* 'he is mad', Skt. *budhyáte* 'he is awakened', and reflect the type which underlies the Arm. passive *i*-presents (cf. Meillet 1936: 107).

While Schmitt adopts Meillet's derivation of the *č'*-presents from **-sk-ye-* (1981: 136), Klingenschmitt follows Pedersen's early derivation of *-č'e-* from **-ske-* (1982: 68,84), though he derives *harc'ane-* 'ask' and *hayc'e-* 'request' from **prk-ske-* and **Hais-ske-*, respectively, with dissimilation of **-sk-* on an ad hoc basis. This is clearly an arbitrary way of dealing with the facts.

Assuming that *čanač'em* represents **ǵnH³sk-ye-*, we conclude that the expected reflex of PIE **CRHC* is *CaRaC* in Armenian. For *canawt'* we must start from the participle **ǵnH³tos* and the verbal noun **ǵnH³tis*, which should yield **canaw* and **canay*, respectively, as is clear from the 3rd sg. middle ending *-aw* < **-ato* and the word *bay* 'verb' < **bati-* < **bhH²tis*. Since the characteristic **-t-* was lost in these formations, it is reasonable to expect an analogical replacement or restoration of the suffix.

Pedersen has observed that "das suffix *-ti-* nur da produktiv geblieben ist, wo es mit anderen suffixalen elementen zu einer umfangreicheren endung verwachsen war [e.g., *goveſt* 'praise',

imast 'understanding', *erewoyt* 'appearance', *atawt'k* 'prayer']. Die erweiterung des urspr. suffixes scheint oft dadurch zustande gekommen zu sein, dass man die endung *-ti-* in ganz unursprünglicher weise direkt an den konsonantischen auslaut eines suffixes gefügt hat [e.g., *erašt* 'dryness' < **-sk-*, *cnund* 'childbirth' < **-n-*, *t'ak'ust* 'concealment' < **-u-s-*]" (1905: 218f.). The motivation for this development is of course the loss of **-t-* after a vowel. Thus, I think that the dental suffix was restored in **canaw-* < **ǵnH³tos* after stage 13 of my chronology (1980: 102) before the rise of new intervocalic obstruents. The generalization of *-awt'* rather than *-ayt'* may be due to the influence of *awt'* 'passing the night' and the suffix *-oyt'*, as in *erewoyt* 'appearance', a formation which Bugge already compared with Gr. *-ευσις* (1893: 80) and which became productive in later Armenian. This suggests that the introduction of *-awt'* in *canawt'* and *atawt'k* was anterior to the development of **eu* into *oy*. The theory proposed here accounts for *canawt'* on the basis of a single phonetic reflex of PIE **CRHC* and without invoking an unmotivated introduction of a suffix of unknown origin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bugge S.

1893 "Beiträge zur etymologischen erläuterung der armenischen sprache," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 32, 1-87.

Godel R.

1975 *An introduction to the study of Classical Armenian*.
Wiesbaden.

Klingenschmitt G.

1982 *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden.

Kortlandt F.

1980 "On the relative chronology of Armenian sound changes,"
Proceedings of the First international conference on

Armenian linguistics, 97-106. Delmar.

Meillet A.

1936 *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*. Vienna.

Pedersen H.

1905 "Zur armenischen sprachgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 38, 194-240.

1906 "Armenisch und die nachbarsprachen," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 39, 334-484.

Schmitt R.

1981 *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen mit sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen*. Innsbruck.

Winter W.

1965 "Armenian evidence," *Evidence for laryngeals*, 100-115.
The Hague.

